

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,682,423 (Brosnan et al.). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Brosnan et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,876,284 (Acres et al.).

Claim Amendments

Claims 1 and 5 are amended to further patentably distinguish over Bronson et al. Claims 2 and 6 are amended to be consistent with the claims from which they depend.

The Cited Art

Brosnan et al. discloses a gaming machine network 50. The network 50 includes a community of gaming machines 2, servers 71-74, communication interfaces 52, and a network 60. The network 60 provides digital communication between all the nodes in the network 50. (Col. 6, lines 14-21). The servers 71-74 each provide a separate gaming service for the gaming machines. (Col. 6, lines 37-44).

The gaming machines 2a-2c communicate with the network 60 through communication interfaces 52a-52c. (Col. 7, lines 4-14). A gaming machine interface is located in a gaming machine top box 209 or on a main communication board 210 within a gaming machine cabinet. Alternatively, a gaming machine interface may be mounted to the side of a gaming machine cabinet. (Col. 14, lines 6-15; FIG. 1B).

The servers 71-74 communicate with the network 60 via communication interfaces 52d-52g. The communication interfaces 52d-52g provide data transmission and communication protocol translation services for the servers 71-74. (Col. 6, lines 47-50). Each server may use a different proprietary communication protocol, remote computer, and proprietary network hardware and connection scheme to communicate game information within the network 50. A communication interface for each server is then responsible for providing data transmission services for each server onto the common protocol and hardware used on the network 60. (Col. 6, lines 54-61).

The gaming machines and the servers are connected to their respective communication interfaces by a wired game service connection 54. (Col 7, lines 4-6; col. 8, lines 57-60; col. 9, lines 19-23; FIG. 1A). The communication interfaces 52a-52c for the gaming machines are connected to the network 60 by network lines 57. The network lines may use a wired, wireless or combination connection scheme. (Col. 10, lines 2-6; col. 16, lines 55-61; FIG. 1A). The

communication interfaces 52d-52g for the servers are in communication with the network 60 via an appropriate communication protocol. (Col. 6, lines 58-66).

Applicants' Claimed Invention Would Not Have Been Obvious

Three criteria must be met to establish obviousness. First, the prior art must provide one of ordinary skill in the art with a suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the teachings of the references relied upon in rejecting the claims. Second, the prior art must provide one of ordinary skill in the art with a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art, either alone or in combination, must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the rejected claims. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed invention, as well as the reasonable expectation of success, must come from the prior art and not from Applicants' disclosure. If any one of these criteria is not met, a case of obviousness is not established.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-9 would not have been obvious in view of Brosnan et al., either alone or in combination with other references.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a gaming network including a plurality secure wireless servers structured to couple to one or more information servers. The secure wireless servers are located in an area in which gaming machines are available for play. The gaming network further includes a secure wireless receiver, other than the one or more information servers, structured to couple to at least one of the secure wireless servers and to create a secure data channel between that secure wireless server and the secure wireless receiver.

Brosnan et al. discloses that the network lines 57a-57c between the communication interfaces 52a-52c for the gaming machines 2a-2c may use a wireless scheme to connect to the network 60. The servers 71-74 of Brosnan et al. are also connected to the network 60 by the communication interfaces 52d-52g.

In the Office Action, it was said that the communication interfaces 52d-52g correspond to the secure wireless server of claim 1. (Office Action of November 1, 2007, ¶3). However, the communication interfaces are not servers. Rather, they provide data transmission services and hardware connectivity for each server 71-74. (Col. 6, line 58 to Col. 7, line 3).

Also, the communication interfaces 52d-52g are not located in an area of a casino, for example, in which gaming machines are available for play. Instead, the communication interfaces are located on the network 60 at a location remote from the gaming machines. (Col. 6, lines 47-61).

Claim 5 calls for a system for redeeming tickets. The system includes a plurality of secure wireless servers structured to couple to one or more information servers. The secure

wireless servers are distributed around a gaming floor in which at least one gaming machine is located. The system further includes a secure wireless receiver, other than the one or more information servers, structured to couple to at least one of the secure wireless servers and create a secure data channel between the at least one secure wireless server and the secure wireless receiver.

As noted, the communication interfaces 52d-52g of Brosnan et al. are not servers. Also, they are not distributed around a gaming floor.

Further, no references have been cited to establish that secure communications within the context of Applicants' claimed invention would have been obvious. (Office Action of November 1, 2007, ¶3). Similarly, no reference has been applied against the subject matter of claim 9. (Office Action of November 1, 2007, ¶9). Additionally, no explanation has been provided as to why the subject matter of claim 8 would have been obvious. Suitable evidence to establish a prima facie case of obviousness must be provided. MPEP § 2144.03.

Thus, for at least these reasons, claims 1-9 would not have been obvious in view of Brosnan et al., either alone or in combination with other references.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance of the claims at the earliest possible date is requested.

If prosecution of this application can be assisted by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' undersigned attorney at (510) 663-1100.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this amendment (including any fees due for an extension of time), such fees may be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. IGT1P304).

Dated: 2/1/08

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER/WEAVER, LLP



William J. Egan, III
Reg. No. 28,411

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250